



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

fel zu beheben und den Leser mit einem reinen künstlerischen Eindruck zu entlassen, schliesse unser Bericht mit der vollständigen Wiedergabe eines dichterischen Gebildes von kostbar eigenartigem Werte. Dass gerade dieses Gedicht, oder besser diese Suite von Gedichten, aus der Feder einer Frau herrührt, diene mir auch zur Entschuldigung dafür, dass in der vorstehenden Besprechung mit der beliebten Sitte gebrochen wird, die „Frauendichtung“, gleichsam als eine Sache sui generis, gesondert zu betrachten.

Stille.

Von Hedda Sauer.

I.

Ich horche hinaus, horche so lange schon
auf Deinen Schritt
Und höre nur fremdes Leben, fremden
Tritt.
Sehe Gesichter, auf denen kein Glanz
Deines Lächelns liegt,
Sehe Gestalten, an die sich niemals Dein
Arm geschmiegt.
Sehe breite, lange Wege, deren Ziel Dein
Haus nicht ist,
Und grüner Bäume Wolken, die nicht
Dein Blick durchmisst.
Blauen Fliederbusch, der im Windhauch
wie Amethyst erklirrt,
In den sich niemals, niemals Dein dunkler
Blick verirrt . . .
Ich horche hinaus, so lange, lange auf
Deinen Schritt —
Und höre nur fremdes Leben, fremden
Tritt.

II.

Eine Uhr, die stet und laut geschlagen,
Hat eine Hand gehemmt,

Vor klagende Süsse und süsses Klagen
Den Riegel gestemmt. — — —

Alle Schiffe sind im Hafen
Und ohne Wacht,
Die ganze Welt ist eingeschlafen
In der leblosen Nacht.

Die Sterne fallen ins Gelände,
Es ist mir fast,
Als ob das Herz auch stille stände
In des Schweigens Last.

III.

Stille, Stille. Fern hat ein Hund gebellt.
Am Himmel ein Glanz von tausend Ju-
gendnächten,
Duftumstellt, blumen- und baumum-
stellt
Das Zimmer, um das sich blanke Rosen
flechten.
Drunten blüht ein blasses Perlenrund,
Feucht und taukühl sind die Garten-
bänke,
Fern im Dorfe bellt ein Wächterhund,
Und mir ist, als ob ich Sehnsucht tränke.

IV.

Die Zeit ist da, doch zögert die Dunkel-
heit,
Hängen blieb das Abendrot in der Bü-
sche Lieblichkeit,
Und der Atem der Nacht hat den schwe-
lenden Docht,
Hat die Pfingstrosen nicht zu löschen
vermocht.
Die Stille, die ringsum jedem Laut das
Sterben gebot,
Löscht ein Herz nicht, das laut ist und
rosenrot.

II. German School Reform. Reply.

To the Editor of
"Monatshefte für deutsche Sprache
und Pädagogik."

In reply to Professor Prokosch's review, in your February number, of my article on "German School Reform", in the Wisconsin Journal of Education, I wish first to state that my contribution itself contained nothing which I desire to amend or modify in any way. Unfortunately, however, the form in which it appeared is open to criticism, and at least those strictures of Professor Prokosch on the omission of the bibliography, the editorial note in the September number, and the change

of title in the October number are fully justifiable. For these things, however, I cannot accept the responsibility. May I present (with the consent of Professor O'Shea) a bit of documentary evidence in substantiation of this fact?

September 1, 1908.

Prof. S. H. Goodnight,
University of Wisconsin,
Madison, Wisconsin.

Dear Mr. Goodnight:—

The first installment of your article appears in the September issue of the Journal, which is just coming from the press. I think I wrote you when I sent the manuscript to the printer

that it seemed too long in its original form for the Journal, so that it was advisable to run it in two numbers. I think more good will be accomplished by it in this way, since brief articles will be read through by our readers where long ones will be skipped.

In editing the article it seemed to me desirable to save space by eliminating some of the references, since not one in a thousand of our readers can read the German, and they have no access to the references which were cited in the article. Moreover, an article with many footnotes frightens practically all our readers. I hope you will approve of this editorial change to make the article adapted to the particular needs of our readers. I am sending the second part of the article to the printer, and it will appear in the October issue of the Journal.

Very cordially yours,

M. V. O'Shea.

I may add that, while I made no objection to the division of the article, I had no idea, as the letter shows, of the additions and subtractions until the first number had appeared and the second part had been sent to the printer. The note, the second title, "Lessons from the German Schools", and all the numerous paragraph titles, are from the editor's pen, not from mine. Of the four foot notes which escaped the editorial shears, the second now reads as follows: "The present sketch is based upon a number of modern books on education by German writers." I take pleasure in communicating here this note verbatim as it was sent to the Journal:

"The present sketch is based upon the following books:

1. A Kalthoff: Schule und Kulturstaat. Leipzig. 1905.
2. Alex. v. Gleichen-Russwurm: Bildungsfragen der Gegenwart. Berlin. 1907.
3. Ludwig Gurlitt: Der Deutsche und seine Schule. Berlin. 1906.
4. Ludwig Gurlitt: Der Deutsche und sein Vaterland. Berlin. 1906.
5. Ludwig Gurlitt: Erziehung zur Mannhaftigkeit. Berlin. 1907.
6. Wm. Münch: Eltern, Lehrer und Kinder i. d. Gegenwart. Berlin. 1906.
7. Achim v. Winterfeld: Gesunde Jugend-erziehung, Schulreform und Herder als ihr Vorkämpfer. Leipzig. 1906.
8. H. Hilmer: Deutsche und amerikanische Volksbildung. Ein Vergleich. Leipzig. 1907.
9. Rob. Pilzer: Das Verbindungswesen auf Norddeutschen Gymnasien. Berlin. 1880 (2).
10. Max Nath: Schülerverbindungen und Schülervereine. Erfahrungen, Studien und Gedanken. Leipzig. 1906.
11. Hans Kleinpeter: Mittelschule und Gegenwart. Wien und Leipzig. 1906.
12. Paul Förster: Deutsche Bildung, deutscher Glaube und deutsche Erziehung. Pr. 1906.
13. L. Passage: Ein ostpreussisches Jugendleben. Leipzig. 1906.
14. Ellen Key: Das Jahrhundert des Kindes. Übertr. von Francis Maro. Berlin. 1907.

No effort has been made to collate the voluminous periodical literature on the subject. The following articles have come under the writer's observation:

1. Bernhard Riedel: Gefahren der Staatsschule für die Pädagogik. Neue Bahnen, XVII, 1905-6.
2. H. Ilgenstein: Misshandelte Volkserzieher. Blaubuch, Nr. 26, 1906. Cf. also other articles by Ilgenstein in Nos. 32, 34 and 37.
3. Dr. Andrae (Kaiserslautern): Die pädagogische Krisis der Gegenwart. Leipz. Lehrerzeitung, Nr. 17, 1907.

The "Tag", "Blaubuch", and "Neue Bahnen" contain many articles bearing on the theme in question. Much is also published in smaller teachers' journals not generally accessible. Some that are frequently mentioned in this connection, but which have not been examined by the writer, are: "Der Hauslehrer", pub. by Berthold Otto, Grosslichterfeld; "Blätter für deutsche Erziehung", pub. by Arthur Schulz, Friedrichshagen; "Der Säemann", pub. by Carl Goetze, Hamburg; and "Der Volkserzieher", "Der Selbsterzieher", "Der Menschheits-erzieher", and "Die Germanenbibel", various stages of a journalistic enterprise by Wilhelm Schwane, of Berlin."

Aside from the foot notes, titles and sub-titles, however, the article itself is printed as it was sent in. And, granting that the omission of this distinct statement of sources was unfortunate, and that the editorial note, upon which the reviewer lays so much stress, was in

a measure misleading, I still maintain that no unprejudiced reader, having carefully read the article, should affirm, "dass es sich bei den meisten Stellen unmöglich entscheiden lässt, ob sie vom Verfasser selbst oder von seinen Gewährsmännern herrühren." How much pains the reviewer has taken to decide this question, to which he justly attaches prime importance, is nicely illustrated by the following instance. With regard to the frequently noted proneness of the German citizen to adapt himself to this niche and to allow things to be done for him by officialdom, I said: "And, according to these critics, the schools do nothing to counterbalance this tendency; they rather foster it." The reviewer writes: "Selbstverständlich, meint der Verfasser, (!) arbeitet die Schule aus allen Kräften auf die Entwicklung solcher Bürgereigenschaften hin."

And it is by no means only in this single instance that the source of the criticism is plainly apparent from the wording of the paper. While single sentences chosen at random might not answer the question, the article as a whole certainly does. After a brief introduction, in which there is certainly no desire manifest to carp and cavil,—rather the contrary,—the purpose and scope of the article are clearly defined thus: "A very considerable amount of pedagogical and reformatory literature has appeared, and is appearing in Germany at the present time, which calls loudly for reform of the educational system. A brief summary of the trend of this self-criticism may be of interest to American teachers, since it not only contains valuable lessons for us, but also affords us an opportunity to see ourselves as others see us." From this point on to the concluding paragraphs there is a constant recurrence of phrases intended to keep distinctly before the mind of the reader the fact that this is the summary in question. "— German schools are as mercilessly taken to task in these criticisms —" (229); "— that calls forth the loudest protests from the educational reformers in question." "They point to —" (230); "And, according to these critics, —" (230); "The complaint is especially loud against the humanistic Gymnasium, which is said to —" (230); "— if we are to believe what these German educators tell us." (230); "The Leipzig papers are still busy with —" (273); "— a phase of the problem no less vigorously attacked by the books under

consideration." (273); "— — are also severely criticised." (274); "The complaint that is now made is along the same line, but more serious, namely that —" (274); "Some of the pictures drawn are dark indeed —" (274); etc. Such language, it seems to me, should be incapable of the misinterpretation it has met with. But even if it were less clear, is the reviewer so unfamiliar with the demands of the reformers, indeed of thousands of German school men who do not reckon themselves among the reformers at all, that he fails to recognize them in this little digest? If so, he is hardly sufficiently informed on actual conditions there to warrant his sitting in judgment upon a paper of this kind, even though written by a "foreigner". And if he does recognize them, why does he profess in his critique to be unable to determine their source?

Or does he, perchance, take the position that these criticisms come from only a few educational nihilists? that they are not acknowledged by German scholars of repute? Wilhelm Münch, Professor of Pedagogy in the University of Berlin, recently published a very able serial article entitled: "A General View of German Pedagogy for the Benefit of Foreigners."* Professor Münch, never a radical, and in this article, as may readily be surmised from the title, exceedingly conservative, and justifiably so, takes a profoundly sympathetic view of the present day school system of Germany, championing it against critics both at home and abroad, and certainly laying himself open to no charge of prejudice against it, or any part of it. But even he diplomatically admits the "defects of our qualities", as he calls them, naming specifically (XVI, 147-150) a list of dangers and shortcomings in the schools as they now are which bears a striking resemblance to the chief strictures of the prominent reformers, summarized in my paper, and which the reviewer seems so little inclined to take seriously.

But my chief purpose in writing this reply is to correct, in so far as I may be able, the false impression bound to be produced by the review among the readers of the "Monatshefte" as to my own attitude on this question. Since I am devoting my best endeavors to the advancement in America of what seems to me to be the best that Germany has

* See "The School Review." University of Chicago Press. Vols. XV, XVI, 1907-1908.

to give us, I naturally resent being put before my colleagues in the light of a hostile critic and scoffer of things German. I pass lightly over the innuendo concerning my being a foreigner in Germany,—although my opportunities for observation, as well as my training, entitle me to formulate and express opinions on both countries quite as much as Professor Prokosch. But I owe it to myself to protest against the impression certain to be produced, e. g., by the remark: "Dies [i. e., the summary of the adverse criticisms of the German reformers] ist der Hauptinhalt der Artikel; eine kurze Stelle über Vorteile der deutschen Gymnasien bezieht sich im wesentlichen auf ihren besseren Sprachunterricht." The natural inference is, that aside from a grudging concession as to better language teaching, I say nothing good of the German system and German schools. And this is the implication not only of this sentence, but of the entire review. May I quote the passage to which the reviewer refers in full? and may I point out to him, since the wording of the paragraph seems not to have made it clear to him, that it contains my own views, based upon observation and experience, as well as upon the literature named?

"These [i. e., the summary] are the features of the German educational system which are held up by the reformers for unfavorable comparison with our own. As stated in the beginning, the pictures are in the main overdrawn. Those who know the product of the German schools know full well that the training must be of a superior kind. He who has worked in a seminary in a good German university can testify to the excellence of the scholarship usually displayed there, even by the younger members only recently entered from the gymnasium. They are especially strong in languages. The writer recently attended the commencement exercises of the Nicolai Gymnasium in Leipsic, and listened to four well-delivered addresses by members of the graduating class in the Greek, Latin, French and German tongues respectively. The music for the occasion was furnished by the gymnasium choir of about forty well-drilled voices and by an orchestra of the older students. An examination of the laboratories, of the drawings displayed, of the curriculum, etc., produced a uniformly good impression.

"The traditional German patience, thoroughness and industry are no myth. Beyond doubt the preparation of German teachers for their work is on the average more adequate than that of our own, and the apparatus and the methods they use are generally of the best. This is the reverse side of the picture, the side commonly presented to us, and which these reformers take pains to conceal. They do not point out, either, that conditions vary materially in different states. Prussia and Saxony suffer more from bureaucracy than Bavaria and Württemberg, for example. In many cities, too, "Reform Gymnasias" are doing much to remedy the evils above enumerated."

While I also admit in my paper that some of the evils against which the reformers inveigh, do exist in an unfortunate degree, that is no more than all frank friends of the German schools concede, and no more than I freely concede in the same paper concerning our own. And that the spirit of my sketch was neither malicious nor gloatingly triumphant, I again submit to my colleagues by reproducing here the closing paragraph.

"But generalizations on such broad themes are difficult and dangerous, and comparisons are odious, at best. The educational system of a nation is not an independent entity, but is based upon that nation's development, traditions, characteristics, society, and political, as well as cultural institutions. And the foundation must determine, to a large extent, the shape of the superstructure. Only in the details can the latter be remodelled without a corresponding alteration of the former. Germany can no more adopt our system of education in toto than we can adopt hers. It was not with the thought of making propaganda for the ideals of either that the present sketch was written, but only to characterize the present reform movement in Germany. On the whole, the wide-awake educators of all lands have the same goal in view—the introduction of more life and sunlight into the school, the banishment of compulsion and the cultivation of intelligent interest, the development of strong moral characters and well-balanced, well-informed minds in healthy, happy bodies."

S. H. Goodnight.